

- Meets the need of 80% of parents who seek the tools and content descriptions to choose media for their children (according to Kaiser Family Foundation Research).
- Extends to other forms of media consumed by children via the TV including video games, movies, and music.
- Reaches the 50% of US TV households that subscribe to digital cable, satellite, or digital broadcast, and grows with the penetration of digital transmission.
- Avoids new hardware, components, or manufacturing that increases television manufacturers' UPC (as did the V-Chip) given that it is a software solution.
- Covers broadcast and cable programming equally, unlike much of the legislation proposed around the issue of violence and indecency. To the 87% of US Households that subscribe to cable or DBS, the lines between broadcast and cable programming are fuzzy at best.
- Supports current parental controls and media ratings (TV Ratings, MPAA), as well as other rating or review systems proffered by other independent organizations in the future

Offering Parents TV Zone to US Families

Based on our experience, the satellite TV providers appear interested in offering such a product on a subscription basis. However, after extensive discussions at the highest levels of management, we have met with some skepticism on the part of the country's largest cable operators.

We would welcome the opportunity to demonstrate the product for you in person so that your deliberations going forward are informed by all of the available options for addressing the pressing needs of children and families.

The undersigned appreciate your dogged pursuit of a solution that meets the needs of American families and children. We will contact your office to confirm the reception of this material and to answer any questions that you or your staff might have.

Sincerely,

Convergent Media Solutions – providers of Parents TV Zone

Stephan Fopeano

Christopher Galazzi

Daniel Miles

Dan Schwartz

Stephanie Kost

From: Dan Miles [dpmiles@growthstone.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2004 8:00 PM
To: KJMWEB
Cc: stephanf@parentstvzone.com; dschwartz@parentstvzone.com; chrisg@parentstvzone.com
Subject: Violent Television and its Impact on Children (Docket 04-261)



ParentsTVZone_On
esheet.doc (29...

Mr. Commissioner,

This letter is intended to contribute to your ongoing investigation regarding the issue of violence in television and its effect on children. Your investigation is evidence that parents seek greater assistance in evaluating and filtering media for their children. The undersigned agree and believe that the new technological capability of digital cable, satellite, and digital broadcast can enable parents to control their own children's exposure to violence without infringing on anyone's rights to free speech. Better information and tools make legislative restrictions on expression unnecessary.

Better Tools to Support Family Choice

Research shows that parents will embrace a solution that provides 1) quality, unbiased information about program contents so that they can make well-informed choices for their children, and 2) the technical means to implement those choices quickly and easily. Three elements are essential to a truly effective media management solution: quality, unbiased information, a control mechanism that is easy to use, and consumer awareness. The existing V-Chip program has laid the foundation for the solution. However, the evolution of the media landscape – in both content and technology – requires and supports an evolution in the V-Chip to meet the needs of US families.

The CMS Solution

Convergent Media Solutions (CMS) has developed Parents TV Zone – a “next generation V-Chip” that improves greatly on the current system. With Parents TV Zone families can, in effect, create a personal a la carte service that meets individual needs, interest and values by filtering the program guide for the child according to the parent's personal tastes and values. Parents TV Zone provides:

Quality Information from a Neutral Independent Third Party

Much like food labels, Parents TV Zone provides in-depth summaries of program attributes that are most relevant to children -- positive and negative. Parents TV Zone program information is consistent and reliable because it is based on published standards, many of which have been developed by leading education and health organizations in the US. We believe the Parents TV Zone information is a vast improvement over the existing Parental Guidelines given its consistency, granularity, and objectivity.

Ease-of-use

Parents TV Zone can stand alone as a virtual channel, it can be integrated into the program guide, or it can be a separate menu item on interactive television systems. Program content summaries are available on-demand. Parents can make age-based program selections by simply choosing a viewing level, or choose from a menu of options for more granular control of specific content attributes.

Aggressive promotion

Low usage rates for the V-Chip are not surprising. Few people know about it because there is no entity that has an economic incentive to promote it. As a for-profit entity, Convergent Media Solutions has a vested interest in generating as much use and awareness as possible among its primary end-users: parents.

Summary of Advantages

Parents TV Zone is a superior solution for enabling parents to manage their children's TV and media consumption. The attached description provides more detail about the Parents TV Zone, in addition to these key points:

- Enables parents to, in effect, create customized a la carte service on program-by-program basis that meets and reflects personal needs, interests, and values.

- Meets the need of 80% of parents who seek the tools and content descriptions to choose media for their children (according to Kaiser Family Foundation Research).
- Extends to other forms of media consumed by children via the TV including video games, movies, and music.
- Reaches the 50% of US TV households that subscribe to digital cable, satellite, or digital broadcast, and grows with the penetration of digital transmission.
- Avoids new hardware, components, or manufacturing that increases television manufacturers' UPC (as did the V-Chip) given that it is a software solution.
- Covers broadcast and cable programming equally, unlike much of the legislation proposed around the issue of violence and indecency. To the 87% of US Households that subscribe to cable or DBS, the lines between broadcast and cable programming are fuzzy at best.
- Supports current parental controls and media ratings (TV Ratings, MPAA), as well as other rating or review systems proffered by other independent organizations in the future

Offering Parents TV Zone to US Families

Based on our experience, the satellite TV providers appear interested in offering such a product on a subscription basis. However, after extensive discussions at the highest levels of management, we have met with some skepticism on the part of the country's largest cable operators.

We would welcome the opportunity to demonstrate the product for you in person so that your deliberations going forward are informed by all of the available options for addressing the pressing needs of children and families.

The undersigned appreciate your dogged pursuit of a solution that meets the needs of American families and children. We will contact your office to confirm the reception of this material and to answer any questions that you or your staff might have.

Sincerely,

Convergent Media Solutions – providers of Parents TV Zone

Stephan Fopeano

Christopher Galazzi

Daniel Miles

Dan Schwartz

Stephanie Kost

From: DAN WARD [danandjaneal1@netzero.net]
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2004 2:07 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

DAN WARD
199 RUSTY DRIVE
FENTON, MO 63026

October 18, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

,

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

DAN WARD

Stephanie Kost

From: DAN WARD [danandjaneal1@netzero.net]
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2004 2:07 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

DAN WARD
199 RUSTY DRIVE
FENTON, MO 63026

October 18, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein
,

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

DAN WARD

Stephanie Kost

From: DAN WARD [danandjaneal1@netzero.net]
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2004 2:07 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

DAN WARD
199 RUSTY DRIVE
FENTON, MO 63026

October 18, 2004

Kevin J Martin

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

DAN WARD

Stephanie Kost

From: DAN WARD [danandjaneal1@netzero.net]
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2004 2:07 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

DAN WARD
199 RUSTY DRIVE
FENTON, MO 63026

October 18, 2004

Michael K Powell

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

DAN WARD

Stephanie Kost

From: Dana Duhon [dduhon@bplb.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 4:55 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

Dana Duhon
CPA
799 Superior Rd
Church Point, Louisiana 70525

October 19, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Dana Landry-Duhon
3379884930
CPA

Stephanie Kost

From: Dana Duhon [dduhon@bplb.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 4:55 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

Dana Duhon
CPA
799 Superior Rd
Church Point, Louisiana 70525

October 19, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein
,

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Dana Landry-Duhon
3379884930
CPA

Stephanie Kost

From: Dana Duhon [dlduhon@bplb.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 4:55 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

Dana Duhon
CPA
799 Superior Rd
Church Point, Louisiana 70525

October 19, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein
,

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Dana Landry-Duhon
3379884930
CPA

Stenhanie Kost

From: Dana Duhon [dlduhon@bplb.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 4:55 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

Dana Duhon
CPA
799 Superior Rd
Church Point, Louisiana 70525

October 19, 2004

Michael K Powell
,

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Dana Landry-Duhon
3379884930
CPA

Stephanie Kost

From: Dana Smotherman [david-dana@peoplepc.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2004 4:34 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Dana Smotherman
12209 Davison Road
Davison, MI 48423

October 17, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

David and Dana Smotherman

Stephanie Kost

From: Dana Smotherman [david-dana@peoplepc.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2004 4:34 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Dana Smotherman
12209 Davison Road
Davison, MI 48423

October 17, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

David and Dana Smotherman

Stephanie Kost

From: Dana Smotherman [david-dana@peoplepc.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2004 4:34 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Dana Smotherman
12209 Davison Road
Davison, MI 48423

October 17, 2004

Michael K Powell

,

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

David and Dana Smotherman

Stephanie Kost

From: Dana Smotherman [david-dana@peoplepc.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2004 4:34 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Dana Smotherman
12209 Davison Road
Davison, MI 48423

October 17, 2004

Kevin J Martin

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

David and Dana Smotherman

Stephanie Kost

From: Daniel Fritz [fritzs.DT@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 9:06 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Daniel Fritz
1225 lipscomb st.
Grapevine, TX. 76051

October 13, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

,

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Daniel Fritz
817 442 9841

Stenhanie Kost

From: Daniel Fritz [fritzs.DT@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 9:06 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Daniel Fritz
1225 lipscomb st.
Grapevine, TX. 76051

October 13, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

,

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Daniel Fritz
817 442 9841

Stephanie Kost

From: Daniel Fritz [fritzs.DT@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 9:06 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Daniel Fritz
1225 lipscomb st.
Grapevine, TX. 76051

October 13, 2004

Michael K Powell

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Daniel Fritz
817 442 9841

Stephanie Kost

From: Daniel Fritz [fritzs.DT@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 9:06 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Daniel Fritz
1225 lipscomb st.
Grapevine, TX. 76051

October 13, 2004

Michael J Copps

Dear Michael Copps:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Daniel Fritz
817 442 9841

Stephanie Kost

From: Daniel Fritz [fritzs.DT@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 9:06 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Daniel Fritz
1225 lipscomb st.
Grapevine, TX. 76051

October 13, 2004

Kevin J Martin

,

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Daniel Fritz
817 442 9841

Stephanie Kost

From: dara feilert [fw2552@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 6:07 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

dara feilert
1520 downey st.
lansing, mi 48906

October 13, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy
,

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Dara L.Feilert

Stephanie Kost

From: dara feilert [fw2552@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 6:07 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

dara feilert
1520 downey st.
lansing, mi 48906

October 13, 2004

Michael J Copps

,

Dear Michael Copps:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Dara L.Feilert

Stephanie Kost

From: David Lane [dblane@cox.net]
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2004 4:51 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

David Lane
1241 SW 43rd
Oklahoma City, Ok 73109

October 16, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy
,

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

David Lane

Stephanie Kost

From: David Lane [dblane@cox.net]
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2004 4:51 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

David Lane
1241 SW 43rd
Oklahoma City, Ok 73109

October 16, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

David Lane

Stephanie Kost

From: Carol Potter [coteandus@tds.net]
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2004 8:53 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Carol Potter
2304 8th Street
Rockford, IL 61104

October 18, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy
,

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Carol Potter

Stephanie Kost

From: Carol Potter [catsandus@tds.net]
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2004 8:53 AM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Carol Potter
2304 8th Street
Rockford, IL 61104

October 18, 2004

Michael K Powell

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Carol Potter

Stephanie Kost

From: Carol Potter [coteondus@tfs.net]
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2004 8:53 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Carol Potter
2304 8th Street
Rockford, IL 61104

October 18, 2004

Kevin J Martin

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Carol Potter

Stephanie Kost

From: Carol Potter [mailto:carolp@ids.net]
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2004 8:53 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Carol Potter
2304 8th Street
Rockford, IL 61104

October 18, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Carol Potter

Stephanie Kost

From: carole Morgan [mailto:cmorgan@nj.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2004 4:51 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

carole Morgan
Citizen
536 Abbott Avenue
Ridgefield,n.j , NJ 07657

October 20, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein
,

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Carole Morgan
201-943-9502
Citizen

Stephanie Kost

From: carole Morgan [cmorgan@nj.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2004 4:51 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

carole Morgan
Citizen
536 Abbott Avenue
Ridgefield,n.j , NJ 07657

October 20, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein
,

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Carole Morgan
201-943-9502
Citizen